

## **REMARKS**

Minor amendments have been made to claims 1, 22, 26, 33, 39, 40, 41, 44 and 50.

Claim 4 has been cancelled and the features therein have been incorporated into claims 1, 22, 26, 33, 39, 40 and 41. Claims 1-54 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9, 26-30, 41, 44-51 AND 53 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GOLDING ET AL. (U.S. PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2003/0014501; HEREINAFTER “GOLDING”)(newly cited) IN VIEW OF SUZUOKA ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,933,832; HEREINAFTER “SUZUOKA”)(previously cited):**

Neither Golding nor Suzuoka, individually or combined, disclose “extracting documents updated or collected during a first time period; calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents based on a number of link relations of said particular one referencing to the other extracted documents and of said particular one referenced by the other extracted documents during the first time period; and calculating a popularity transition degree indicating both a direction and a degree of transition of the popularity degree for each of the extracted documents during the first time period,” as recited in amended claim 1, for example.

Various embodiments of the present invention calculate the popularity of a document based upon a specific point in time, for example (see page 2 of the Specification). Therefore, the present invention has the advantage of showing how the popularity of a document changes over time. Further, various embodiments of the present invention show how the popularity degree of a document increases but does not decrease, by calculating the popularity based on the number of links, and to enable the obtaining of the popularity degree of the document in time-series order (see page 3, lines 13-21 of the specification).

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Golding discloses all of the features of claim 1 except “extracting documents updated or collected during a first time period”. However, the Examiner asserts that Suzuoka discloses this feature.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Golding merely discloses a process of ranking entries (i.e., a hyperlink to a specific web page on the Internet) by examining the documents themselves to determine for example, a number of documents linked to each document, and a number of documents that the document is links to, and scoring each entry (see paragraph [0026]).

Further, Suzuoka merely discloses a retrieval system for frequently updating data on the

Internet. Specification, data update frequency of a page is used as a barometer for popularity and the contents of a database are divided in accordance with the data update frequency (see column 4, lines 44-48). That is, Suzuoka ranks the data based upon the updating frequency of the page and not the actual contents in the page (see column 4, lines 48-52). Therefore, there is no motivation to combine Golding and Suzuoka. Thus, the combination of Golding and Suzuoka fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10-17, 19-25, 31-37, 39, 40, 42, 43 AND 54 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GOLDING IN VIEW OF MUKAI (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,446,095)(previously cited):**

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Golding fails to disclose judging whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents of the first document," as recited in claim 10.

However, the Examiner asserts that Mukai discloses this feature. The Applicant respectfully submits that neither of the foregoing references, individually or combined, disclose this feature.

Instead, Mukai merely discloses a document storage means which stores link data and documents composed of texts and link information associated with the link data (see column 3, lines 1-9). Further, Mukai discloses producing a predetermined graphic in accordance with a degree of importance of the link data segment, and displaying texts in the specific document and the predetermined graphics (see column 3, lines 10-22). Mukai fails to link images in one document to data within another document, for example. That is, Mukai fails to disclose "whether the second document is a non-text document related to contents in the first document," as recited in claim 10.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited references.

Thus, the combination of Golding and Mukai fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE  
OVER GOLDING IN VIEW OF MUKAI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF PAGE (U.S.  
PATENT NO. 6,285,999)(previously cited):**

Claim 18 depends from claim 10. Therefore, the comments in section II above, may be applied here also.

**IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 38 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE  
OVER GOLDING IN VIEW OF MUKAI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF EDLUND ET AL.  
(U.S. PATENT NO. 6,546,388) (previously cited):**

Claim 38 depends from claim 33. Therefore, the comments in section II above, may be applied here also.

**V. CONCLUSION:**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By:

  
Deidre M. Davis  
Registration No. 52,797

Date: 2/21/2006  
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501